

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA

11 JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 ROB M JACKSON et al.,

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:22-cv-05480-TL

ORDER ON REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

16
17 This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable
18 J. Richard Creatura, Chief United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 8) and Plaintiff John Robert
19 Demos, Jr.'s objections to the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 9). Having reviewed the
20 Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff's objections, and the remaining record, the Court
21 OVERRULES Plaintiff's objections, ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation, and DISMISSES the
22 case without prejudice.

23 A district court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or
24 specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (“[The Court] must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.”). “The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *accord* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party properly objects when the party files “specific written objections” to the report and recommendation as required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2). Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Report and Recommendation.

Mr. Demos is under pre-filing bar orders in a number of courts, including this Court, the Eastern District of Washington, the Washington State courts, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and the United States Supreme Court. *See, e.g., Demos v. Storrie*, 507 U.S. 290, 291 (1993). As a bar order litigant, Mr. Demos may submit only three *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) applications and proposed actions each year. *See In re John Robert Demos*, MC91-269-CRD (W.D. Wash. Jan. 16, 1992). Nevertheless, the Court returned the original Report and Recommendation in this case to the Magistrate Judge for a determination on imminent danger consistent with *Demos v. Holbrook*, 848 F. App’x 779 (9th Cir. 2021) (vacating denial of IFP status and administrative closure of action under a bar order and remanding with instructions to consider the possible application of the imminent danger exception); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) (demonstrating “imminent danger of serious physical injury” allows litigants to obtain IFP status despite a bar order).

Plaintiff’s raises a number of issues in his filing, but his actual objection takes issue with whether the bar order against him in this district, *see In re John Robert Demos*, MC91-269-CRD, Dkt. 1 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 16, 1992) (1992 Bar Order), can “override[] a plausible claim of

1 imminent danger.” Dkt. No. 9 at 7. *See also id.* at 8 (referencing *Holbrook*, 848 F. App’x 779).¹
 2 However, Plaintiff’s objection assumes that he makes a plausible claim of imminent danger
 3 when, in fact, he does not.

4 So far in this calendar year alone, Plaintiff has brought at least six cases in which he
 5 appears to raise claims relating to the mishandling of the COVID-19 and/or monkeypox
 6 pandemics. *See e.g., Demos v. Strange*, No. 3:22-cv-05084 (W.D. Wash. 2022); *Demos v.*
 7 *Strange*, No. 3:22-cv-05463 (W.D. Wash. 2022); *Demos v. Strange*, No. 3:22-cv-05464 (W.D.
 8 Wash. 2022); *Demos v. Washington State Department of Corrections*, 2:22-cv-00723, Dkt.
 9 Nos. 1-1, 2, 4 (W.D. Wash. 2022); *Demos v. Washington State Department of Corrections*, 3:22-
 10 cv-00724, Dkt. Nos. 1-1, 2, 4 (W.D. Wash. 2022); *Demos v. State of Washington et al*, 2:22-cv-
 11 00769, Dkt. Nos. 1-1, 2, 3 (W.D. Wash. 2022). Two of those cases were identical and were even
 12 filed on the same day. *Compare Demos v. Strange*, 3:22-cv-05463, Dkt. No. 1-1 with *Demos v.*
 13 *Strange*, 3:22-cv-05464, Dkt. No. 1-1. All six cases have been dismissed. In addition, the
 14 complaint in this case is nearly identical to a case filed in the Eastern District of Washington
 15 except for three additional questions presented in the proposed complaint before this Court.²
 16 *Compare* Dkt. No. 1-1 at 10-11 with *Demos v. Inslee*, 4:22-cv-05106-SAB, Dkt. 1 at 10-11 (E.D.
 17 Wash. 2022). Plaintiff in this case simply makes generalized complaints about certain
 18 populations in the facility, claims he has “contracted the deadly Covid-19 virus some 4+ time,

19
 20 ¹ Plaintiff also includes an argument questioning how he can be “required to pay a mysterious court filing fee, if
 21 *Demos* does not know the exact amount of the court filing fee, as court filing fee amounts are static and fluctuating
 and change ever[y] so often.” Dkt. No. 9 at 2. Courts publicly post their fee schedules on their websites. The fee
 schedule for the Western District of Washington is available at
<https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/FeeSchedule.pdf>.

22 ² The Eastern District of Washington case was originally filed as an application for permission to file a successive
 petition for writ of habeas corpus on June 23, 2022, only a week before this civil rights case was filed in this Court.
 23 *See Demos v. Jackson*, 4:22-cv-05079-SAB, Dkt. No. 1. The Eastern District transferred the case to the Ninth
 Circuit which denied *Demos* authorization to file a successive petition, but noted that the proposed complaint
 24 included with the application “included a civil rights complaint.” *See id.*, Dkt. Nos. 2, 5. Plaintiff’s civil rights
 complaint was then separately filed and dismissed at *Demos v. Inslee*, 4:22-cv-05106-SAB, Dkt. Nos. 1, 4.

1 and counting”, and then asserts “Plaintiff pleads imminent danger.” Dkt. No. 1-1 at 4-5. Claims
2 of imminent danger that are speculative and without support are insufficient to avoid a pre-filing
3 bar order. *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1055, 1050 n.11 (9th Cir. 2007).

4 For the foregoing reasons, the Court ORDERS:

- 5 1. The Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 8) is hereby APPROVED and ADOPTED;
- 6 2. Plaintiff’s claims are DISMISSED without prejudice, all pending motions are
7 DENIED as moot, and the case shall be CLOSED; and
- 8 3. The Clerk is DIRECTED to send copies of this order to Mr. Demos and the Hon. J.
9 Richard Creatura.

10
11 Dated this 2nd day of November 2022.

12 
13 _____
14 Tana Lin
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24